

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-11 are pending the above-identified application. Claim 7 has been incorporated into claim 1. Support for new claims 10 and 11 is found in original claims 8 and 9, for example.

Allowable Claims

The Office Action of August 9, 2005 indicates that claim 9 is allowable and has newly been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim.

As explained in more detail below, claim 7 was only rejected based on the combination of Oomori '704 (US 2002/0034704) and another reference, but with the submission of the English translation of the Priority Document of the present application, Oomori '704 has been removed as effective prior art thereby removing this rejection. Thus, claim 7 has been placed into allowable form and its incorporation into claim 1 places all of the presently pending claims into allowable form.

Issues under 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barclay '086 (USP 6,492,086) in view of Padmanaban '690 (USP 5,846,690).

The above-noted rejection has been removed upon the incorporation of claim 7 (not rejected) into claim 1. Consequently, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 1 and 3-8 have rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oomori '704 in view of Padmanaban '690.

Applicants submit with this Amendment a verified English translation of the Priority Document for the present application, i.e. Japanese Patent Application No. 2001-059724 filed on March 5, 2001 in Japan. It is submitted that all of the subject matter recited in the present claims is fully supported by the disclosure of this Priority Document. Thus, applicants have removed Oomori '704 as effective prior art under 35 USC 102 and 103. Consequently, an essential basis

Application No. 10/084,182
Amendment dated February 9, 2006
Reply to Office Action of August 9, 2005

Docket No.: 2185-0623P

for the above-noted rejection (which is based on Oomori '704 and Padmanaban '690) has been removed such that this rejection should be withdrawn.

It is submitted for the reasons above that the present claims define patentable subject matter such that this application should now be placed in condition for allowance.

If any questions arise in the above matters, please contact Applicant's representative, Andrew D. Meikle (Reg. No. 32,868), in the Washington Metropolitan Area at the phone number listed below.

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), the Applicants hereby petition for an extension of three (3) months to February 9, 2006 in which to file a reply to the Office Action. The required fee of \$1020 is enclosed herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: February 9, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Andrew D. Meikle
Registration No.: 32,868
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant

Enclosure: Verified English Translation of Priority Document